How to Use the American Diabetes Association's Type 2 Diabetes Algorithm

John N Clore MD, MS

American Diabetes Association.

Disclosures of Interest

• I have no conflicts

Key points to emphasize

New information -- Updated October 5, 2018 at EASD meeting in Berlin

- 1. Update informed by evidence generated in the past 2 years
- 2. Greater focus on lifestyle interventions, with increased emphasis on weight loss and obesity management, including metabolic surgery
- 3. Greater focus on patient related issues and self-management which have a major impact on success of any pharmacological interventions
- 4. Preferred choices of glucose-lowering agents driven by new evidence from CVOT and consideration of areas of major clinical need (for example weight and risk of hypoglycemia)
- 5. GLP-1 RAs are preferred to insulin as first injectable

American Diabetes Association.

Balancing Risks and Benefits for Personalized Goals

More Stringent Control

- No hypoglycemia
- Less complexity/polypharmacy
- Lifestyle or metformin only
- Short disease duration
- Long life expectancy
- No CVD



Less Stringent Control

- History of severe hypoglycemia
- High burden of therapy
- Longer disease duration
- Limited life expectancy
- Extensive co-morbidity
- CVD

Improving Glycemic Management

- Focus on treatments for glycemic control
 - Behavioral approaches
 - Medications
 - Metabolic surgery
- Address increasing complexity of patient centered therapeutic decisions in the context of expanding therapeutic options and new information on benefits and risks

American Diabetes Association.

Putting the Patient at the Center of Care





Decision cycle for patient-centered glycemic management in type 2 diabetes.

Shared decision making in type 2 diabetes

SDM can improve

- decision quality
- patient knowledge
- patient risk perception

Ethical imperative for support of patients' autonomy

Diabetes Self-Management Education and Support (DSMES)

- Is available to patients at critical times
- Individualized to the needs of the person, including language and culture
- Structured theory-driven written curriculum with supporting materials
- Delivered in group or individual settings by trained educators
- Promote healthy eating, physical activity, good medication-taking behavior, and increase self-efficacy
- Supports person and their family in developing attitudes, beliefs, knowledge and skills to self-manage diabetes
- Includes core content and monitoring of patient progress, including health status, quality of life.
- Evidence-based

American Diabetes Association.

Empathic patient-centered care

- Patients with diabetes often live with multiple chronic conditions
- Providers & health care systems should prioritize the delivery of empathic, individualized patient-centered care
- To determine what is the best management option for each patient, consider each individual's
 - personal, social and biomedical context,
 - his/her values,
 - reasons he/she values the available options, and
 - relative contribution of each option in terms of benefits, harms, costs and inconveniences.



Persistence and medication adherence

- Mean medication adherence rate ≈ 75%, average proportion of patients adherent to medication < 70%.
- Adherence slightly varies between orals vs injectable therapy and individual classes
- Discontinuation rates range from 10% to 60% (both in observational studies and in clinical trials)

American Diabetes Association.

Clinical Inertia

Clinical inertia: failure of healthcare providers to initiate or intensify therapy when indicated, due to:

- overestimation of care provided
- use of "soft" reasons to avoid intensification of therapy
- lack of education, training, and practice organization aimed at achieving therapeutic goals

Glucose-Lowering Medication in Type 2 diabetes: overall approach

Foundational therapy is metformin and comprehensive lifestyle management (including weight management and physical activity)

Metformin is the preferred initial glucose lowering medication for most people with T2D

This recommendation is based on the efficacy, safety, tolerability, and extensive clinical experience with this medication. Results from UKPDS showed benefits of initial treatment with metformin in clinical outcomes related to diabetes, with less hypoglycemia and weight gain than with insulin or sulfonylureas.

American Diabetes Association.



British Medical Journal 2000; 321: 405-412

(fatal or non-fatal myocardial infarction or sudden death)

Intensive (metformin) vs. Conventional glucose control



Metformin Monotherapy

- 1. Recommended dosage 1000 mg BID (if tolerated)
- 2. Titrate slowly over 1-2 weeks (500 mg increments and always with food)
- 3. Use of extended release highly recommended
- 4. Continue full dosing if GFR > 45 cc/min
- 5. Reduce to 500 mg BID if GFR 30-45 cc/min
- 6. STOP Metformin if GFR less than 30

Foundational therapy is metformin and comprehensive lifestyle management (including weight management and physical activity)

Recommendation:

The stepwise addition of glucose lowering medication is generally preferred to initial combination therapy.

While there is some support for initial combination therapy due to the greater initial reduction of A1C than metformin alone, there is little evidence that this approach is superior to sequential addition of medications for maintaining glycemic control, or slowing the progression of diabetes.

Since the absolute efficacy of most oral medications rarely exceeds 1% reduction in A1C, initial combination therapy should be considered in patients presenting with A1C levels more than 1.5% above their target. Fixed-dose formulations can improve medication-taking behavior when combination therapy is used and may achieve glycemic targets more rapidly.

American Diabetes Association.



Recommended Process for Glucose Lowering Medication Selection: Where Does New Evidence From Cardiovascular Outcome Trials Fit In ?



Foundational therapy is metformin and comprehensive lifestyle management (including weight management and physical activity)

American Diabetes Association.

Step 1: Assess cardiovascular disease

Presence of cardiovascular disease is compelling indication





Liraglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes N Engl J Med 2016;375:311-22.

Semaglutide and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes N Engl J Med 2016;375:1834-44.

Empagliflozin, Cardiovascular Outcomes, and Mortality in Type 2 Diabetes N Engl J Med 2015;373:2117-28

Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular and Renal Events in Type 2 Diabetes N Engl J Med 2017;377:644-57.

Dapagliflozin and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes N Engl J Med 2019;380:347-57..

American Diabetes Association.

Considerations

- ASCVD is defined differently across trials
 - Established CVD (e.g. MI, stroke, revascularization procedure)
 - Very high cardiovascular risk
- Each cardiovascular outcomes trial, while large, is a single experiment
- It is not always clear whether differences in trial findings within a drug class are related to trial design or to true differences in the individual medications
 - Where evidence suggests a hierarchy, this is noted

CHOOSING GLUCOSE-LOWERING MEDICATION IN THOSE WITH ESTABLISHED ASCVD OR CKD



Liraglutide and CVOT



Semaglutide and CVOT



American Diabetes Association.

Marso SP et al. N Engl J Med 2016;375:1834-1844

Semaglutide and HbA1c/Weight



American Diabetes Association.

Marso SP et al. N Engl J Med 2016;375:1834-1844

GLP-1 and CVOT

	Lixisenatide	Liraglutide	Semaglutide	Exenatide
3 pt MACE	1.02	0.87	0.74	0.91
	0.89-1.17	0.78-0.97	0.58-0.95	0.83-1.00
CV Death	0.98	0.78	0.98	0.88
	0.78-1.22	0.66-0.93	0.65-1.48	0.76-1.02
Non-fatal MI	1.03	0.88	0.74	0.97
	0.87-1.22	0.75-1.03	0.51-1.08	0.85-1.10
Non-fatal stroke	1.12	0.89	0.61	0.85
	0.79-1.58	0.72-1.11	0.38-0.99	0.70-1.03
HF Hospitalization	0.96	0.87	1.11	0.94
	0.75-1.23	0.73-1.05	0.77-1.61	0.78-1.13
All cause mortality	0.94	0.85	1.05	0.86
	0.78-1.13	0.74-0.97	0.74-1.50	0.77-0.97

American Diabetes Association.

Diabetes Care 2018 Jan; 41(1): 14-31.

SGLT2i and MACE

	Patients		Events	Events per 1000 patie	nt-years	Weight (%)		HR		HR (95% CI)
	Treatment (n)	Placebo (n)	-	Treatment	Placebo					
Patients with athero	sclerotic cardiov	/ascular diseas	e							
EMPA-REG OUTCOME	4687	2333	772	37.4	43·9	29.4	-	▰┤		0.86 (0.74-0.99)
CANVAS Program	3756	2900	796	34.1	41·3	32.4	_	∎—│		0.82 (0.72-0.95)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	3474	3500	1020	36.8	41·0	38.2		╼┥		0.90 (0.79-1.02)
Fixed effects model f	or atherosclerot	ic cardiovascu	lar disease	e (p=0·0002)				◆		0.86 (0.80-0.93)
Patients with multip	le risk factors									
CANVAS Program	2039	1447	215	15.8	15·5	25.9	_	#		0.98 (0.74-1.30)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	5108	5078	539	13.4	13.3	74·1		-		1.01 (0.86-1.20)
Fixed effects model for multiple risk factors (p=0-98)								1.00 (0.87-1.16)		
						0.35	0.50 ← Favours treatmen	1-00 t Favou	2-50 urs placebo	

American Diabetes Association.

Lancet 393:31, 2019

If ASCVD Predominates:

GLP-1 RA with proven cardiovascular benefit

 Strongest evidence for liraglutide > semaglutide > exenatide LAR

SGLT2-i with proven cardiovascular benefit

 Modest evidence for empagliflozin > canagliflozin



American Diabetes Association.

Caveats and Questions

No evidence of CVD benefit in those at lower cardiovascular risk

The combination of SGLT2-i and GLP-1 RA has not been tested in cardiovascular outcome trials



Proven CVD benefit means it has label indication of reducing CVD events. For GLP-1 RA strongers evidence of iraquites - semaplinite - exenative. For SGU2I evidence modestly stronger for emographicati- e cancellation. Be aware that SSU2I vary by region and individual agent with regard to indicated level of eGPR to indicate of accelerate one.

Both empapilitics and canaglifizerin have shown reduction in HF and reduction in CKD progression in CVDTs Degladec or UTBI glargine have demonstrated CVD safety Lew door may be better barbord thoughts sew list barbiel for CVD effects Chrone Later generation SU with lawer risk of hypoplycaemia

CHOOSING GLUCOSE-LOWERING MEDICATION IN THOSE WITH ESTABLISHED HF OR CKD



American Diabetes Association.

Among patients with ASCVD in whom HF coexists or is of concern, SGLT2 inhibitor are recommended

Rationale: Patients with T2D are at increased risk for heart failure with reduced or preserved ejection fraction

Significant, consistent reductions in hospitalization for heart failure have been seen in SGLT2-i trials

Caveat: trials were not designed to adjudicate heart failure

Majority of patients did not have clinical heart failure at baseline



SGLT2i and Heart Failure



American Diabetes Association.

Lancet 393:31, 2019

SGLT2i and Heart Failure

	Patients		Events	Events per 1000 patient-years		Weight (%)	HR		HR (95% CI)	
	Treatment (n)	Placebo (n)		Treatment	Placebo					
Patients with history	of heart failure									
EMPA-REG OUTCOME	462	244	124	63.6	85.5	23.6		-		0.72 (0.50-1.04)
CANVAS Program	803	658	203	35.4	56.8	34.1	B			0.61 (0.46-0.80)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	852	872	314	45.1	55·5	42.4				0.79 (0.63-0.99)
Fixed effects model f	or history of hea	art failure (p<0	0.0001)				-			0.71 (0.61-0.84)
Patients with no history of heart failure										
EMPA-REG OUTCOME	4225	2089	339	15.5	24.9	30.0	——			0.63 (0.51-0.78)
CANVAS Program	4992	3689	449	13.6	15.2	32.4		-		0.87 (0.72-1.06)
DECLARE-TIMI 58	7730	7706	599	8.9	10.5	37.6				0.84 (0.72-0.99)
Fixed effects model for no history of heart failure (p<0.0001)									0.79 (0.71-0.88)	
						0.35	0.50 1.	00 2	.50	
							←	\rightarrow		
							Favours treatment	Favours placebo		

American Diabetes Association.

Lancet 393:31, 2019

SGLT2i and Renal Progression



American Diabetes Association.

Lancet 393:31, 2019

Recommendation:

For patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease, consider use of a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor or glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist shown to reduce risk of chronic kidney disease progression, cardiovascular events, or both. C

Several of these medications have demonstrated renal benefit and cardiovascular benefit and should be considered as part of treatment.

American Diabetes Association.

American Diabetes Association. 9. Pharmacologic approaches to glycemic treatment: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes 2019. Diabetes Care 2019;42(Suppl. 1):S90–S102



CHOOSING GLUCOSE-LOWERING MEDICATION IF COMPELLING NEED TO MINIMISE HYPOGLYCAEMIA

American Diabetes Association.

CHOOSING GLUCOSE-LOWERING MEDICATION IF COMPELLING NEED TO MINIMISE WEIGHT GAIN OR PROMOTE WEIGHT LOSS



- Semaglutide > liraglutide > dulaglutide > exentide > licisenatide B eaver that SGLT2 vary by region and individual agent with regard to indicated level of eRF for inhibition and continued usine Choose later generation SU with lower risk of hypoglycaema 4. Low door may be better tolerated though less well studied for CPU offects



CHOOSING GLUCOSE-LOWERING MEDICATION IF COST IS A MAJOR ISSUE



American Diabetes Association.

Consensus Recommendation: In patients who need the greater glucose-lowering effect of an injectable medication, **GLP-1 receptor agonists are the preferred choice to insulin**. For patients with extreme and symptomatic hyperglycaemia, insulin is recommended.





Case Study

- Patient: Ms. F
- Age: 57
- Occupation: CEO of local non-for-profit
- **Diabetes Hx:** 6 years; BMI 27; no cx; struggles with weight, eats out frequently, daily schedule
- Current Meds: metformin, saxagliptin, insulin detemir 36 units HS
- A1C: 8.1%, anti-GAD negative, eGFR >60 ml/min/1.73m
- BG pattern: fasting average 142 mg/dL, post-meal average 207 mg/dL, no hypoglycemia
- Patient/Provider Goals: avoid complications, facilitate weight loss, dosing simplicity

Strategy for Ms F

- Ensure she has received (adequate) DSMES
- Maximize metformin (if not already)
- Consider GLP-1 as next step
- D/C DPP4i if add GLP-1
- Taper insulin if possible. Consider switch to longer acting insulin or give detemir BID if insulin still needed and insurance dictates choice

American Diabetes Association.

Case Study

- Patient: Mrs. L
- Age: 77
- Occupation: retired teacher
- Diabetes Hx: 12 years, no retinopathy, no nephropathy, no neuropathy sx, SU caused hypoglycemia, SGLT2-i yeast infections, pioglitazone edema Cardiovascular History: none
- Current Diabetes Meds: metformin 500mg BID, pioglitazone 30 mg daily
- A1C: 8.3%
- **BG pattern**: fasting average 145 mg/dL, post-meal average 200 mg/dL, infrequent hypoglycemia
- Patient/Provider Goals: healthy aging

Strategy for Mrs L

- Establish HbA1c goal
- Ensure she has received (adequate) DSMES
- Maximize metformin
- D/C pioglitazone
- Consider DPP4i

American Diabetes Association.

Case Study

- Patient: Mr. K
- Age: 51
- Occupation: drives a delivery truck
- **Diabetes Hx:** 8 years,; BMI 28; microalbumin/creatinine ratio < 20; + non-proliferative retinopathy, active, eats out every day
- A1c: A1C: 9.5%, anti-GAD negative, eGFR >60 ml/min/1.73m2
- Cardiovascular History: CVA last year (slurred speech, left-sided weakness) w/ full recovery, stopped smoking
- Current Diabetes Meds: metformin 500 mg ER 3 tabs per day, pioglitazone 30 mg daily
- Cardiovascular Meds: ARB, statin, ASA
- BG pattern: fasting average 160-180 mg/dL, post-meal average 260 mg/dL, no hypoglycemia
- Patient/Provider Goals: avoid complications, support healthy eating

Strategy for Mr K

- Establish HbA1c goal
- Encourage lifestyle changes and DSMES
- Maximize metformin
- D/C pioglitazone
- Consider GLP-1 vs basal insulin
- If Hba1c not at goal with changes, consider addition of basal insulin to GLP-1



Recommendations

In most patients who need the greater glucose-lowering effect of an injectable medication, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists are preferred to insulin. B

Intensification of treatment for patients with type 2 diabetes not meeting treatment goals should not be delayed. B

The medication regimen should be reevaluated at regular intervals (every 3–6 months) and adjusted as needed to incorporate new patient factors. E

American Diabetes Association.

American Diabetes Association. 9. Pharmacologic approaches to glycemic treatment: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes 2019. Diabetes Care 2019;42(Suppl. 1):S90–S102

Conclusions

An important early step in this new approach: consider the presence or absence of ASCVD, CKD, and heart failure.

In patients with ASCVD, some GLP-1 RA and SGLT2-i are recommended in these patients.

Conclusions

Among patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease at high risk of heart failure or in whom heart failure coexists, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors are preferred.

For patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease, consider use of a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor or glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist shown to reduce risk of chronic kidney disease progression, cardiovascular events, or both.

• Studies of HF or CKD as primary outcome are ongoing with SGLT2-i.

American Diabetes Association.

Summary

Consider the presence or absence of ASCVD, CKD and HF Start with metformin if tolerated, then:



In patients with ASCVD a GLP-1 RA or SGLT2-i is recommended

In patients with HF SGLT2-i is recommended

ල්ළු In patients with CKD, with or without ASCVD consider an SGLT2-i

Agents with proven benefit are preferred

ASCVD, CKD and HF affects choice of additional glucose lowering medication

Thank you